From: Tom Casey
To: mcguigan-david
Date: Thursday, April 13, 1995 10:31 am
Subject: Greetings

Thanks for stopping by. The trip went alright-- I got a fair amount of work done-- but the weather was horrible. I hear that it's still snowing there.

Michael Ioff told me about the quench water issue at Clairton. I would have to check to be certain, but it's possible that the planning people (me and my counterparts in Allegheny County) interpreted the quench water rule the same way that GASP did. I understoood that it would be expensive (and wasteful) to use fresh water with each quench, but I figured that by using settling tanks (as well as filtration or some other method) the water being used to quech could still be **as clean** as river water. The reg probably needs to be clarified.

Anyway, I do know how to model the stuff, and it wouldn't take too much time, the qustion is, "Am I the right person to do it?" It seems that, after our conversation, Michael understands what emissions to model.*** The modeling itself is generally the responsibility of Makeba Morris's Section. Even if I had all the time in the world, I would be overstepping my bounds by working on it without her O.K.

If the learning curve is too steep for someone in Makeba's Section to do this (I understand that Al is away) in the time that it is needed, Makeba should probably send a quick message to Diana Esher.

*** i.e.: model the quench tower only, with emissions based on both our and GASP's interpretations of the reg and decide if the diference in risk is important (in the context of all of the other emissions in the area); assume that PM emissions = f(solids, dissolved solids in water) as in PM attainment SIP modeling; assume that all volitiles are emitted; assume that all semivolitiles are emitted, or, to refine, maybe estimate their evaporation rate (often estimated, in other applications, as a function of the Henry's Law constant and the agitation of the water)